

Appln No. 09/944,348  
Amdt date June 13, 2008  
Reply to Office Action of May 17, 2007

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In the Office action mailed May 17, 2007, claims 29-88 were rejected. Claims 29-82 were rejected on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,286,140 and various items of art, and claims 29-82 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103.


Claims 29-82 are now cancelled, with applicant reserving the right to pursue these claims in a further application.

Claims 83-88 were rejected solely on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,266,140. A terminal disclaimer may be used to overcome a rejection based on a non-statutory double patenting ground.

A terminal disclaimer believed to be in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.321(c) is filed herewith.

Accordingly, allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By   
Daniel M. Cavanagh  
Reg. No. 41,661  
626/795-9900

DMC/rmw

RMW IRV1114430.1 • 06/13/08 4:28 PM